

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
MAY 20 2008

## REMARKS

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

Reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 has been amended in order to recite that the tightener (18) is used to assemble the nozzle-ramps to the nozzle-holder ramps. Claim 1 has also been amended to point out that the second tighteners (24) are for the assembly and blockage of the nozzles (14) to the nozzle-holder ramps. In addition, claim 1 has been revised to point out that the first washers are interposed between the ramps (15), the at least one collector (13) and the first tighteners (18), and wherein second washers (27) are interposed between the nozzles (14), the ramps (15) and the second tighteners (24).

These amendments are supported by the original claims and by the specification at pages 7-8. Amendments have been made in the text of the dependent claims so that they correspond to the amended text of claim 1. In addition, new claim 1 now recites the features described in original claim 16 and on page 7, lines 12-15 of the specification as filed. Claims 2, 12 and 16 have been canceled. The amended text of claim 1 corresponds to the original disclosure and for this reason it is requested that this ground of rejection be withdrawn.

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the applicant regards as the invention.

Reconsideration is requested.

Original claims 2, 12 and 16 have been deleted without prejudice.

All of the claims have been revised to point out that the invention is concerned with a "water vaporization distribution plant". Original claim 3 has been amended in order to overcome the Examiner's objection specified under item 4 of the Office Action. Claims 4 and 6, have been amended to delete the expressions "in relation to the demands of the receiving plant complex" and "compatible with the physico-chemical characteristics of the circulating water".

Original claim 11 has been amended to substitute the word "hold" with the word "hole" to correct the typographical error in the claim. The claims have been reviewed and where appropriate have been edited to avoid the objections raised by the Examiner. For these reasons, it is requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Claims 1-5, 7-11, 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hayman Jr. (Hayman).

Reconsideration is requested.

Amended claim 1 points out a water vaporization distribution plant that differs from the plants described in Hayman in that blocking elements are used in order to grant a safe positioning of the nozzles tightened by means of tighteners to nozzle holder ramps with square or rectangular sections.

In particular, the blocking elements prevent the nozzles from falling from the ramps with the possibility of being entrained by the stream of air towards the moving organs of the turbine as described at page 11, lines 15-20 of the specification. Thus, the plant assembly can be performed *in situ* without the need of a highly qualified staff or without the need of a pre-assembly performed by a qualified staff in order to have a precision apparatus that may be operated safely, according to the specification at page 4, lines 5-15.

For these reasons, the Hayman patent fails to anticipate the amended claims and it is requested that this ground of rejection be withdrawn.

An early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted



James V. Costigan  
Registration No.: 25,669

Hedman & Costigan, P.C.  
1185 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, N.Y. 10036-2646  
(212) 302-8989  
Customer No. 47888